2016 Experiment Station Section Award for Excellence in Multistate Research (updated June 2015)

Purpose

The fundamental mandate of the Multistate Research authority allows State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) to *interdependently* collaborate in projects that two or more states share as a priority, but for which no one state could address singularly. This is a very high standard for any research project, and has become a hallmark of the Multistate Research Program's management objectives.

The Multistate Research authority allows other non-SAES partners to join in these project-based collaborations. Thus, many multistate projects include extension specialists as members as well as Agricultural Research Service or Forest Service research scientists. In addition, many projects have private sector participants. Moreover, the majority of multistate projects have participants from more than a single region, with many having representation from all regions such that they are national in scope.

To many, the Multistate Research Program is one of the "best kept secrets" of the Land-grant University System.

The purpose of this Experiment Station Section Excellence in Multistate Research Award program is to annually recognize those scientists who are conducting exemplary multistate activities and enhance the visibility of the multistate program. A recipient Multistate Project will be selected from the pool of nominees submitted by the five regional research associations (NCRA, NERA, SAAESD, WAAESD, and ARD), and deemed by the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee to exhibit sustained, meritorious and exceptional multistate activities. The ESCOP Executive Committee will provide final approval.

Award and Presentation

The national winning project will be recognized by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) Chair and USDA/NIFA Administrator during the Awards Program held at the APLU Annual Meeting. Each of the regional award winning projects will also be included in the awards brochure by project number and title, technical committee chair, administrative advisor and participating institutions. This will be created by the Impact Writer and submitted to APLU. The title of the national winning project will be added to a plaque located at the USDA Waterfront Centre.

For the past several years, the Experiment Station Directors have approved a monetary recognition of $15,000 of Hatch Multistate Research Fund (MRF) for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award winner. Up to $5,000 has been available to cover travel for two members of the recipient project (the Administrative Advisor and Chair or their designees), to attend the awards ceremony at the APLU annual conference. The remaining $10,000, and any unused travel funds, have been available to support activities which enhance and contribute to the research and/or outreach objectives of that multistate project, consistent with the appropriate

use of Hatch MRF. Use of these funds is a project committee decision made in conjunction with its Administrative Advisor.

Eligibility

Any current Multistate Project listed in the NIMSS (www.nimss.org) is eligible for consideration for an Excellence in Multistate Research Award.

Basis for Nomination

Each of the five regional research associations may nominate one Multistate Project chosen from the entire national portfolio of active projects. Nominations shall be made to the Chair of the respective regional Multistate Review Committee (MRC) via the regional Executive Director's office. The documentation for this type of nomination should be sufficient to allow the review committee members to evaluate the Project according to the criteria listed below.

Criteria and Evaluation

Regional selection of multistate teams for an Award for Excellence will be based on panel evaluations of nominations that demonstrate: high standards of scientific quality; research relevance to a regional priority; multistate collaboration on the problem's solution; and professional leadership in the conduct of the project. All nominated projects shall be evaluated using the same criteria including, in descending order of importance, the Project's: accomplishments indicated by outputs, outcomes and impacts; added-value and synergistic advantages from the Project's interdependency; degree of institutional participation (SAES and others); extent of multi-disciplinary activity; amount of integrated activities (multi-functional); and evidence of additional leveraged funding to further the Project goals.

Selection Process

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee will serve as the review panel and will select from among the regional nominees a national winner in time for public announcement and award presentation at the APLU Annual Meeting each year. All nominated projects shall be evaluated using the same criteria, as listed above.

Timeline

- October – Announcement sent to Directors, Administrative Advisors and NIMSS participants by ESCOP Chair
- February 28 – Nominations due at Offices of the Executive Directors
- March – Nominations reviewed by regional multistate research review or multistate research collaboration committees and recommendations submitted to regional associations
- March/April – Regional associations approve regional nominations at Spring meetings

- May - Regional associations review, edit and finalize their nomination prior to the final submission
- May 30 – Associations submit final regional nominations to ESCOP Science and Technology Committee
- June – ESCOP Science and Technology Committee reviews regional nominations and submits recommendation for national winner to ESCOP Executive Committee
- June/July – ESCOP Executive Committee selects national winner
- July – National winner submitted to APLU
- September – National winner announced at ESS meeting
- November – Award made at APLU meeting

Nomination Format

A nomination should be a very concise statement. It should include:

Nominating Region: _____

Nominator: _____ E-mail: _____

Project or Committee Number and Title: _____

Technical Committee Chair: _____ E-mail: _____

Administrative Advisor: _____ E-mail: _____

Summary of Significant Accomplishment(s) (noting the following**):**

• The issue, problem or situation addressed by the project or committee;

• The project or committee's objectives;

• The outcome(s) of the research;

• The impacts of the project or activity (actual or anticipated);

• The extent of links to extension that have been formed; and

• Any additional and relevant partnerships, associations or collaborations that deserve mention.

List of Participating Institutions: Add as an appendix

Nominations will be **no more than 3 single spaced pages** (Times Roman 12 point and one inch margins) plus a 1 page Appendix listing Participating Institutions and units for a total of 4 pages. Regions may utilize other information in selecting their nominee. The final regional nomination should be submitted by email to the Office of the regional Executive Director, by **c.o.b. February 28, 2016**:

Chris Hamilton, North Central <christina.hamilton@wisc.edu>
Rubie Mize, Northeast <rgmize@aesop.rutgers.edu>
Donna Pearce, South < donna_pearce@ncsu.edu>
Sarah Lupis, West Sarah.Lupis@colostate.edu
Dr. Carolyn Brooks, ARD-1890s <cbbrooks@umes.edu>